

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 29 2007

**SCHEINBERG & GRINER, LLP**P. O. Box 164140  
Austin, Texas 78716-4140Telephone: (512) 637-0800  
Facsimile: (512) 306-1963DAVID GRINER  
dgriner@sgnlaw.com

November 29, 2007

# Fax

Name: Examiner Olsen  
Art Unit: 1763  
Organization: United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Fax: 1-571-273-8300From: David Griner  
P.O. Box 164140  
Austin, TX 78716-4140Phone: (512) 637-0800  
Fax: (512) 306-1963  
Date: November 29, 2007  
Subject: Notice of Appeal  
Docket No.: F125  
Pages: 33 pages (including this coversheet)APPLICATION No.: 10/758,966 ART UNIT: 1763  
FILING DATE: January 16, 2004 EXAMINER: Allan W. Olsen  
INVENTOR(S): Diane K. Stewart et al.  
TITLE: Electron Beam Processing for Mask Repair

In connection with the above-identified patent application, applicants submit the following:

1. Fee Transmittal (in duplicate) (1 p);
2. Appeal Brief (26 pp.)
3. Petition for Extension of Time (in duplicate) (1 p); and
4. PTO-2038-Credit Card Form (1-p)

David Griner  
Patent Reg. No.: 47,614

Applicants attempted to fax file the attached documents on November 28, 2007. The Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission form received back from the PTO indicated that not all pages were received. Accordingly, Applicants are resubmitting the entire Appeal Brief and all transmittal documents.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from the nature of the transmittal, the information contained in this facsimile message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone and return the original message to SCHEINBERG & GRINER, LLP at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service at our expense.

Attorney Docket No.: F125

**I. Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest in this appeal is:

FEI Company, an Oregon Corporation having its principal place of business in Hillsboro,  
Oregon.

Attorney Docket No.: F125

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no prior or other pending appeals, judicial proceedings, or interferences known to appellant which may be related to, directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

Attorney Docket No.: F125

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 29 2007

**III. Status of Claims**

**A. Total Number of Claims in Application**

There are a total of 14 claims in the application.

**B. Status of All the Claims**

1. Claims canceled: 13-20
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: NONE
3. Claims pending: Claims 1-12 and 21-22
4. Claims allowed: NONE
5. Claims rejected: 1-12, 21-22

**C. Claims on Appeal**

The claims on appeal are: 1-12, 21-22

Attorney Docket No.: F125

**IV. Status of Amendments**

Appellants have not filed any amendments subsequent to final rejection.

Attorney Docket No.: F125

### V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Applicants' claims 1, 21, and 22 are in independent form.

The present invention provides methods of restoring transparency to a substrate having reduced light transmission, for example, from gallium atoms incidentally implanted by a focused ion beam used to remove material. Defects in photolithography masks are often repaired using focused beams of gallium ions. Unfortunately, the ion beam also damages the mask surface and implants gallium ions into the substrate, thereby reducing the transmission of light and adversely affecting the performance of the mask. (Specification, p. 2, lines 10-17.) The transparency of the mask can be restored by etching away the implanted quartz, however removing the implanted material changes the thickness of the substrate which in turn changes the phase of the transmitted light. This also adversely affects the performance of the mask. (Specification, p. 2, lines 18-23; p. 3, lines 1-2.)

Applicants have found that the transparency of the repaired area can be restored by

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**